

October 1, 2002

## **REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. 03-013**

### **2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)**

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is soliciting proposals in response to Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 03-013 for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). The RFP is comprised of the following seven parts: Scope of Work (Attachment 1), Proposal Information, Organization, and Content (Attachment 2), Criteria for Evaluation of Written Proposal (Attachment 3), Criteria for Evaluation of Oral Presentation (Attachment 4), Contract Budget Explanatory Information (Attachment 5), Debarment and Suspension Certification (Attachment 6), and SCAG Conflict of Interest Form (Attachment 7). Firms wishing to respond to RFP No. 03-013 should submit their proposal to the attention of Loretta Anaya, Senior Contracts Administrator, Southern California Association of Governments, 818 W. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017 by 3:00 PM (Pacific) on October 30, 2002.

Your proposal must be received at SCAG by the deadline specified above. We will not accept late submittals. We also will not accept faxed or electronically sent proposals. Any proposal received after the deadline will be returned to the consultant/vendor without further consideration.

Respondents should fully address all components of this RFP and be especially mindful of the following stipulations:

- SCAG reserves the right to disqualify any and all proposals which are not submitted in accordance with the required format described in this RFP.
- Proposals must include a line item budget in the format and detail shown in Attachment 5. A similar detailed budget is required of each subcontractor whose portion of the work is \$25,000 or more.
- **Funding for this project is contingent upon availability at the time of contract award.**
- SCAG does not reimburse respondents for the cost of proposal preparation, even in the event of RFP cancellation.
- Proposals must be printed/copied double-sided on recycled paper that has at least 20% post-consumer material.

- The Debarment and Suspension Certification must be fully completed by all parties to the proposal (prime and all subcontractors).
- The SCAG Conflict of Interest Form must be fully completed by any parties to the proposal whose portion of the overall work is valued at \$25,000 or more. All persons or firms seeking contracts valued at \$25,000 or more must complete and submit this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form to SCAG along with your contract proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subcontractors whose portion of the overall work is valued at \$25,000 or more.
- The three references required in Attachment 2 should not include any SCAG staff.
- Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs), as defined in Title 49, Part 26 of the Code of Federal Regulations, are strongly encouraged to apply.
- All offerors should ensure that they have completed and submitted a SCAG Vendor/Consultant Application, which can be obtained on-line at [www.scag.ca.gov](http://www.scag.ca.gov), under "Doing Business with SCAG." The application is mandatory for all primes, but optional for subcontractors.

The maximum period of performance for this contract is 18 months. There will be a 12-month base period, plus an additional 6-month option. Exercising the 6-month option will be dependent upon available funding and satisfactory performance. Cost proposals should be prepared for the entire 18-month period, but broken out separately by the 12-month base period plus the 6-month option.

A pre-proposal conference has been scheduled from 1:00-4:00 PM on October 9, 2002, in SCAG's San Bernardino A&B Conference Rooms on the 12<sup>th</sup> Floor of 818 W. 7<sup>th</sup> Street in downtown Los Angeles. All interested companies are encouraged to attend.

In addition, firms are asked to reserve the dates of November 12 and 13, 2002, as likely oral presentation (interview) dates. The presentations will be conducted at SCAG's downtown Los Angeles offices as well.

If you have any **technical** questions regarding the Scope of Work, please contact Ted Harris (213) 236-1916 or [harrist@scag.ca.gov](mailto:harrist@scag.ca.gov). **Administrative** questions should be directed either to Loretta Anaya at (213) 236-1866 or Sam Mehta at (213) 236-1813.

Sincerely,

Patricia J. Chen, Attorney  
Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.



## **SCOPE OF WORK**

### **2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)**

---

**RFP No. 03-013**

#### **I. BACKGROUND**

##### **A. Organization Overview**

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which is comprised of six counties (Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside and Imperial) and 186 cities in southern California, is the organization charged with examining and helping to resolve short- and long-term issues impacting the region, particularly those related to transportation. The region has more than 16 million residents and encompasses more than 38,000 square miles, representing the largest and most diverse region in the country.

Decision-making happens through SCAG's Regional Council, a governing body of over 70 city and county elected officials and county transportation commissioners. In addition to the Regional Council, there are four policy committees: Administration Committee, Transportation and Communications Committee, Community, Economic and Human Development Committee, and Energy and Environment Committee. These committees are comprised of Regional Council members, elected official representatives from subregional organizations, single-purpose regional planning organizations, county transportation commissions, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and members representing the Regional Advisory Council -- SCAG's community and private sector advisory group. In addition to the four policy committees, there are various task forces and subcommittees which address specific regional policy and technical planning issues.

##### **B. SCAG's Roles and Responsibilities**

SCAG is officially designated by the Federal and State governments as a Council of Governments (COG), a Multi-County Designated Transportation Planning Agency, and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the southern California region. As such, SCAG has a number of formal authorities and responsibilities, including:

- Conducting a comprehensive transportation planning process that results in a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (or the "Plan") and a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Together these documents serve as the legal basis for transportation decision-making in the region.
- Developing demographic projections and the integrated land use, housing, employment, and transportation programs, measures, and strategies portions of the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan.
- Determining, pursuant to the Clean Air Act, the conformity of SCAG projects, plans, and

- programs to air quality requirements.
- Reviewing and assessing Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) for projects of regional significance.
  - Conducting inter-governmental review of programs proposed for Federal assistance.
  - Serving as the Areawide Waste Treatment Management Planning Agency under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.
  - Preparing Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocations for cities and counties.

### **C. Regional Cooperation and the Subregions**

SCAG places great importance on local input in the regional planning process. SCAG seeks feedback from local elected officials and their staff through 14 subregional organizations that have been recognized by the Regional Council as partners in the regional policy planning process. The subregional organizations represent various parts of the southern California region that have identified themselves as having common interests and concerns. The subregions vary according to geographical size, number of local member jurisdictions, staffing, decision-making structure, and legal status. Most subregions have formal Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) status, while some have a less formal organizational structure and status.

SCAG supports the “bottom-up” regional/subregional policy planning process by identifying tasks and products and budgeting resources for the subregions in its annual work program. The work performed for SCAG under contract by the subregions is consistent with the mandates of the funding agencies and regional policy planning priorities established by the Regional Council.

### **D. 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

The Regional Council adopted the 2001 RTP in April 2001. The 2001 RTP provides an assessment of the overall growth and economic trends in the SCAG region for the years 2001-2025 and gives strategic direction for investments during this time period. SCAG is required by Federal and State law to develop and adopt a revised RTP at least once every three years, and major transportation projects receiving either Federal or State funding must be consistent with the provisions of the latest Plan. The RTP is a critical document because it helps ensure adequate Federal and State funding. It is intended to serve as a catalyst for linking various transportation agency investments within the SCAG region in order to provide a cohesive, balanced, and multi-modal transportation system that addresses regional goals and is consistent with Federal and State requirements.

### **E. 2001 RTP Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)**

When the Regional Council adopted the 2001 RTP in April 2001, they also certified the PEIR for the 2001 RTP. The 2001 RTP PEIR was a first-tier, programmatic document that assessed regional, program-level (i.e., plan-level) environmental impacts of the 2001 RTP and focused on broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures.

The 2001 RTP and 2001 RTP PEIR represent the culmination of more than two years of collaboration between dozens of public agencies, 186 cities, six counties, hundreds of local, county, regional, and state officials, the business community, environmental and community groups, non-profit organizations, and a broad-based public outreach program.

## **II. INTRODUCTION**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines require an EIR for any discretionary government action, including programs and plans, that may cause significant environmental effects. Thus, CEQA requires a PEIR for the 2004 RTP.

This Scope of Work (SOW) outlines SCAG's requirements for a Consultant to prepare and complete the PEIR for the 2004 RTP. The 2004 RTP PEIR must adhere to all applicable requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and, therefore, must be a useful, objective, and comprehensive document that fully discloses the potential significant environmental effects that may be caused by the 2004 RTP. The 2004 RTP PEIR must use good practices and be unbiased in tone and intent. It must be written with clear and concise prose and include explicit graphs and tables. For example, a clear and useful matrix that summarizes the impacts of each plan alternative is required. Furthermore, a useful programmatic RTP PEIR must focus on comparison of alternatives, cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, potential mitigation measures, and other issues that will help inform decision-makers and the public about the potential environmental effects of the 2004 RTP.

The 2004 RTP PEIR will be designed to incorporate analysis from the 2001 RTP PEIR where practicable<sup>1</sup>. Relevant sections of the environmental setting, for example, could potentially be incorporated into the 2004 RTP PEIR, although the 2004 RTP PEIR will require more in-depth evaluation of alternatives, cumulative impacts, and growth-inducing impacts. Site-specific analysis will *not* be necessary for the 2004 RTP PEIR, since site-specific environmental review will be conducted by implementation agencies at later dates as projects in the Plan are developed. For example, site-specific noise contours will not be evaluated at individual airports.

## **III. PRELIMINARY PLAN ALTERNATIVES**

It is anticipated that the 2004 RTP PEIR will evaluate a total of four alternatives: the proposed 2004 RTP and three alternatives. Described below are the four preliminary plan alternatives. These alternatives will change and mature as the 2004 RTP planning process proceeds, and the Consultant will be required to assist SCAG staff in developing and refining the alternatives to ensure that there is an adequate and legally defensible range. Examples of projects within each alternative include, but are not limited to, aviation, freight rail, high-speed passenger rail, highway/roadway construction and widening, and passenger rail construction.

### **A. Proposed 2004 Regional Transportation Plan**

The 2004 Regional Transportation Plan is currently being developed to provide a coordinated and cohesive long-range transportation plan that will support an efficient, balanced, and multi-modal transportation system. As stated above, the proposed 2004 RTP will include a wide range of projects including, but not limited to, aviation, freight rail, high-speed passenger rail,

---

<sup>1</sup> The 2001 RTP PEIR (Draft and Final Addendum Response to Comments) can be obtained at <http://www.scag.ca.gov/peir/>.

highway/roadway construction and widening, and passenger rail construction.

### **B. No Project Alternative**

The No Project Alternative consists of all major projects that are reasonably foreseeable and reasonably expected to go forward without the 2004 RTP, including all projects that have already received funding, are scheduled to receive funding, and/or have received environmental clearance. The No Project Alternative will assume that no safety-related maintenance would be deferred, but the overall appearance and function of the transportation system would be expected to deteriorate.

### **C. Modified 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

The 2001 Regional Transportation Plan Update, adopted in April 2001, will be modified to serve as an alternative in the 2004 RTP Update PEIR. The base year will be adjusted to year 2000, and the planning horizon will be extended out to 2030 in five-year increments. A complete listing of projects in the 2001 RTP Update is available in the SCAG database, and the 2001 RTP and the 2001 RTP PEIR are available at the SCAG website: <http://www.scag.ca.gov/rtp/mainrtp.html>, and, <http://www.scag.ca.gov/peir/>.

### **D. Growth Visioning Alternative**

The Growth Visioning alternative will be developed during the dual Growth Visioning,<sup>2</sup> and RTP 2004 development planning processes. Input from Growth Visioning, transportation planning, and environmental planning will be coordinated to determine the specific projects and policies in the Growth Visioning alternative. As stated above, all of the alternatives will include aviation, freight rail, high-speed passenger rail, highway/roadway construction and widening, and passenger rail construction. This alternative will assume a single aviation scenario and a single growth scenario that will be provided by SCAG Growth Visioning staff.

## **IV. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT**

### **A. Overall PEIR Methodology Recommendation**

All offerors are required to include in their proposal a proposed methodology for implementation of the 2004 RTP PEIR. It is important to keep in mind that all CEQA documents prepared under this contract must be designed as a “tiered” document (as defined in the CEQA Guidelines) that can be used by others for subsequent environmental analysis. The impact analysis must substantively evaluate growth-inducing and cumulative impacts, specifically estimating and comparing the expected long-term development patterns supported by the alternatives.

Furthermore, the alternatives analysis must evaluate the long-term environmental effects of each alternative on each impact category. The cumulative impacts analysis must evaluate impacts of the proposed 2004 RTP in combination with other foreseeable projects and plans anticipated to cause related impacts. To the extent feasible, the cumulative impacts analysis for the 2004 RTP PEIR will need to evaluate the expected impacts of the Plan in 2030 in combination with non-

---

<sup>2</sup> Growth Visioning is a SCAG planning effort to promote livability, mobility, prosperity, and sustainability to make the SCAG region a better place to live, work, and play (<http://www.scag.ca.gov/livable/gvision.htm> ).

transportation plans and projects. In addition, impacts will be evaluated by comparing the expected future impacts of the Plan to both the existing conditions (2000 base year) as well as the expected future No Project Alternative conditions in 2030.

## **B. Alternatives Analysis Methodology Recommendation**

All offerors are required to include in their proposal an explicit recommendation of how analysis of the Preliminary Plan Alternatives should be conducted from a program-level perspective, consistent with the pertinent requirements of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, for purposes of this RFP, offerors should assume that site-specific analysis will be deferred to subsequent CEQA analysis. The following parameters should be considered in developing the recommended methodology for evaluating alternatives:

The base year for the 2004 RTP PEIR will be 2000 and the Plan will extend out to 2030. However, the Consultant may also be required to evaluate environmental impacts for interim years (i.e., 2005, 2010, 2015, 2020, and 2025).

The recommended alternatives analysis must comply with applicable CEQA requirements and result in the evaluation and comparison of a reasonable range of legally defensible alternatives. The alternatives analysis must include an explicit quantitative and qualitative comparison among the alternatives, and a summary of this comparison must be presented in a concise matrix that illustrates the relative environmental impacts of each alternative for each impact category, possibly including ordinal rankings. Furthermore, the analysis must evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of the Plan and the plan alternatives, specifically estimating and comparing the expected long-term development patterns supported by alternative transportation plans.

## **C. Air Quality and Traffic-Circulation Model Studies**

Under the contract, the Consultant will be required to review applicable modeling work performed by SCAG, evaluate its applicability to the PEIR requirements, and incorporate the modeling analysis into the context of the 2004 RTP PEIR. Offerors must identify in their proposal any basic air quality and traffic-circulation modeling analyses that need to be performed by SCAG in order to complete the program-level PEIR analysis.

## **D. Aviation Scenarios**

Under the contract, the Consultant will be required to analyze the potential environmental effects of the proposed 2004 RTP assuming two or three different aviation scenarios that will be provided by SCAG's Aviation Task Force. It is anticipated that each alternative to the proposed 2004 RTP, however, will assume a single aviation scenario.

## **E. Growth Pattern Scenarios**

Under the contract, the Consultant will be required to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed 2004 RTP assuming three or four different regional growth pattern scenarios that will be provided by SCAG. These regional growth scenarios will potentially range from more decentralized, dispersed patterns to more compact, infill development patterns. The total growth forecast for the region, however, will be similar for each growth pattern (i.e., each development

pattern will accommodate a regional population increase of roughly six million over the next 25 years). It is anticipated that each alternative to the proposed 2004 RTP, however, will assume a single growth pattern scenario.

## **V. PROJECT PHASES**

This project consists of five phases. Each phase of work is progressive in its scope and directly contributes to the development of the next phase. The Consultant will be responsible for completing all requirements of each phase.

### **A. Phase I: Project Evaluation and Refinement**

The Consultant shall devise the general methodologies for PEIR implementation, help SCAG develop and refine proposed alternatives, and identify any additional technical analysis necessary in order to complete the PEIR. Specifically, the Consultant shall complete the following tasks during Phase I:

- Review all pertinent project documentation and background materials.
- Conduct literature searches for pertinent project related information and locate useful environmental databases.
- Meet with SCAG staff to identify any specific issues, concerns, and directions regarding implementation of the PEIR.
- Review and comment on the “Notice of Preparation” (NOP), which SCAG staff will prepare and implement.
- Review and assess NOP responses and provide recommendations.
- Develop and finalize a PEIR alternatives-analysis methodology, including final refinement of the alternatives to be used in the PEIR.
- Develop and finalize a PEIR methodology, including:
  - Identifying required and recommended impact categories needed for the analysis
  - Recommending significance thresholds criteria
  - Suggesting document format
- Identify any additional technical studies/evaluations determined to be necessary to augment the program-level analysis, including, but not limited to:
  - Biological resources / endangered species
  - Air quality
  - Water quality
  - Traffic / circulation
  - Growth-inducing impacts: evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of the Plan and the plan alternatives, specifically estimating and comparing the expected long-term development patterns supported by alternative transportation plans.
  - Cumulative impacts: explicitly evaluate the impacts of the proposed 2004 RTP in combination with other foreseeable projects and plans anticipated to cause related impacts. To the extent feasible, the 2004 RTP PEIR will need to evaluate the expected impact of the Plan in 2030, in combination with non-transportation plans and projects.
  - Land use

- Community impacts / socioeconomic: population, housing, and employment
- Prepare an “Environmental Setting” chapter. This work will entail updating the existing conditions, as appropriate, within the region for each environmental impact category.
- Prepare and complete a “Statement of Purpose and Need.” Although the 2004 RTP PEIR is not subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a Statement of Purpose and Need will be included in the appendices of the PEIR to allow subsequent projects that are subject to NEPA to tier their NEPA documents to the PEIR. Thus, the Statement of Purpose and Need will comply with the applicable requirements of NEPA.

**Phase I Deliverables: (due by March 1, 2003)**

- NOP comments
- Assessment of NOP responses and recommendations
- Overall PEIR methodology
- Finalized alternatives and methodology for alternatives analysis
- Environmental setting
- Monthly progress reports (1-2 pages); subject to SCAG’s approval
- Finalize formal PEIR schedule of deliverables; subject to SCAG’s approval

**B. Phase II: Technical Analysis and Administrative Draft PEIR**

Phase II consists of the development and implementation of the technical analysis supporting the development of the PEIR and preparation of the administrative draft PEIR. Specifically, the Consultant shall complete the following tasks during Phase II:

- Initiate and complete all required and recommended technical studies.
- Review, assess, and incorporate air quality and traffic/circulation modeling work into the PEIR analysis.
- Initiate and complete adequate evaluation and comparison of alternative plans.
- Initiate and complete impact assessment of the proposed Plan and the alternatives for all identified impact categories.
- Initiate and complete in-depth cumulative impact evaluations.
- Evaluate growth-inducing impacts.
- Develop useful and effective mitigation measures.
- Complete all necessary appendices work.
- Integrate all completed work from the first two phases into a single administrative draft PEIR using a document format approved by SCAG. The document shall be clear, concise, and useful. Tables and graphs shall be used to explicitly illustrate findings. All text must be written in clear and concise prose (i.e., “plain language”) that is easily understood by decision-makers and the general public.

**Phase II Deliverables: (due by June 15, 2003)**

- Completion of all technical studies and PEIR development
- Administrative draft PEIR (5 copies and 5 CDs)
- Monthly progress reports (1-2 pages); subject to SCAG’s approval

### **C. Phase III: Preparation of the Draft PEIR**

The purpose of this phase of work is to revise the administrative draft PEIR to fully satisfy and respond to SCAG staff's comments on the administrative draft. Once SCAG is satisfied that all relevant comments have been appropriately addressed by the Consultant, then the Draft PEIR will be reproduced by SCAG for public distribution.

#### **Phase III Deliverables: (due by July 15, 2003)**

- Draft PEIR (5 copies)
- Unbound original Draft PEIR (1 copy)
- Draft PEIR in Microsoft Word 97 (5 CDs)
- Monthly progress reports (1-2 pages); subject to SCAG's approval

### **D. Phase IV: Preparation of the Response to Comments on the Draft PEIR**

After the public review period for the Draft PEIR has closed, the Consultant shall prioritize and assess all relevant comments and prepare written responses to the comments for inclusion in the Final PEIR. This will include all comments received through public review of the Draft PEIR, including any written and oral testimony given at public hearings.

#### **Phase IV Deliverables: (due October 2003)**

- Responses to all comments received (5 copies and 5 CDs)
- Monthly progress reports (1-2 pages); subject to SCAG's approval

### **E. Phase V: Preparation of the Final PEIR and Mitigation Monitoring Program**

The Consultant shall revise the Draft PEIR to make it consistent within any modifications suggested in the Response to Comments in Phase IV. In addition, preparation of the Final PEIR shall include a Mitigation Monitoring Program that contains a separate listing of all mitigation measures in the PEIR, along with explicit funding, enforcement, and monitoring responsibilities and clear monitoring schedules.

#### **Phase V Deliverables: (due by February 11, 2004\*)**

- Administrative Final PEIR (5 copies), due in time to incorporate SCAG comments and revisions into the Final PEIR
- Draft Mitigation Monitoring Plan (5 copies), due in time to incorporate SCAG comments and revisions into the Final Mitigation Monitoring Plan
- Final PEIR and Final Mitigation Monitoring Plan (5 sets on CD)
- Unbound, original Final PEIR (1 copy)
- Monthly progress reports (1-2 pages); subject to SCAG's approval

\*Additional work including, but not limited to, additional responses to comments may be required through April 2004.

## **PROPOSAL INFORMATION, ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT**

**RFP No. 03-013**

*All proposals shall contain, at a minimum, the following information:*

### **LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL**

- A brief statement of the respondent's understanding of the work to be done and a positive commitment to perform the work within the required time period.
- Identification of the respondent's cost and fee rate and an estimation of the level of effort required to perform the work.
- A list of the names of the individuals authorized to make representations for the respondent, their titles, addresses, and telephone numbers.

### **TITLE PAGE**

An indication of the RFP No. and project title; a list of all team members (prime and any subcontractors); local address and telephone and fax number of the prime; name and e-mail address of the prime's primary contact person; and date of the proposal. The provision of a current e-mail address for the prime's primary contact person is critical.

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

A clear identification of the material, by section and page number.

### **TECHNICAL APPROACH**

- A statement and discussion of the project objectives, concerns, and sensitive key issues.
- The technical approach for performing the study includes a detailed Scope of Work along with a program for executing the requirements and objectives of the project. A description of the technical approach to be followed for each major task or activity proposed to be performed and annotated outlines of the proposed final report (as applicable) are to be included.
- A discussion of the difficulties expected or anticipated in performing the study, along with a discussion of how the respondent proposes to overcome or mitigate against those difficulties.
- A detailed schedule for completion of the work, including performance and delivery schedules indicating phases or segments of the project, milestones, and significant events.

- A statement of the extent to which the respondent's proposed approach and Scope of Work will meet or exceed the stated objectives discussed in this RFP, and a discussion of how the respondent would modify the project and/or schedule to better meet these objectives in order to minimize costs while maximizing the legal defensibility of the PEIR.

### **PROFILE OF RESPONDENT**

- A statement indicating if the firm is local or national and a summary of representative experience relevant to the work described in the Scope of Work for this RFP.
- The location and telephone number of the office from which the work is to be done.
- Identification of the individuals who will perform the work, including officers, project manager and key staff. State the time commitment and include resumes for key individuals.

### **FEE STRUCTURE/FINANCIAL FORM**

- A completed line item budget (see Attachment 5).
- A budget summary by task.

### **REFERENCES**

A list of at least three references, including the names of contact persons within the firms.

### **SCAG STANDARD CONTRACT LANGUAGE**

Respondents should familiarize themselves with the terms and conditions of SCAG's standard contract language by reviewing the sample SCAG contract posted on-line at [www.scag.ca.gov/business/](http://www.scag.ca.gov/business/). Respondents must identify in their proposal any concerns or objections they would have with any of the contract terms and conditions if selected for contract award.

*Aside from proposal content, respondents should also be aware of the following:*

### **PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE**

The maximum period of performance for this contract is 18 months. There will be a 12-month base period, plus an additional 6-month option. Exercising the 6-month option will be dependent upon available funding and satisfactory performance. Cost proposals should be prepared for the entire 18-month period, but broken out separately by the 12-month base period plus the 6-month option.

## **DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE)**

It is SCAG's policy to make it known that Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs), as defined in 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 26 are strongly encouraged to apply. Firms wishing to get credit for DBE status must be certified at the time of proposal submission. If you are a certified DBE, you must include a copy of your certification with your proposal. For those consultants/ vendors located within the southern California region, certification must be from either the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, the City of Los Angeles, the John Wayne Airport Authority, or the Orange County Transportation Authority.

## **PROPOSAL SUBMISSION**

An original and **5 copies** shall be received by SCAG by 3:00 PM (Pacific) on October 30, 2002, and addressed to the attention of: Loretta Anaya, Senior Contracts Administrator, SCAG, 818 W. 7th Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017. The original should be clearly marked/stamped as such.

**All submissions are considered a matter of public record.**

## **SELECTION PROCESS**

- Respondents will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria described in Attachments 3 and 4.
- Respondents may also be brought in for interviews.

## **NOTIFICATION OF RIGHT TO PROTEST CONTRACT AWARD**

Offerors have the right to protest the contract award in compliance with SCAG's *Policy on Contract Award Protests*, which can be viewed online at [www.scag.ca.gov](http://www.scag.ca.gov) under "Doing Business with SCAG." A written protest must be filed with SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel within seven work days after posting of the Notice of Intent to Award. No verbal protests will be accepted. The protest must be a detailed, written statement of the protest grounds and reference the RFP number and name of the designated Contracts Administrator. The protest must be submitted to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel via both certified mail and fax using the following address and fax number:

Ms. Justine Block, Deputy Legal Counsel  
Southern California Association of Governments  
818 W. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
213.236-1825 fax

The contract award is held up when a protest is received on time by SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel. The contract may not be awarded until the protest is either withdrawn or SCAG's

Deputy Legal Counsel has rendered a decision.

### **FUNDING**

Please note: **Funding for this project is contingent upon availability at the time of contract award.** SCAG is not responsible for any costs or expenses incurred in the preparation of your proposal.

### **MISCELLANEOUS**

- SCAG reserves the right to reject any and all proposals submitted and to request additional information.
- The contract for this work will be awarded to the firm that the selection committee deems best qualified.
- All applicable documentation must be fully executed by each respondent.
- Every proposal submitted is considered a firm offer that must be valid for a minimum of 90 calendar days.

# CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF WRITTEN PROPOSAL

RFP No. 03-013

Consultant Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Max. Possible Points	Points Earned	Comments
<b>I. CEQA EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience with large, programmatic transportation plan Program EIRs</li> <li>Reputation of firm among CEQA experts</li> <li>History of legal defensibility of CEQA documents prepared by Consultant</li> <li>History of commitment to “good practices” when preparing CEQA documents</li> <li>Similar projects completed on time and within budget</li> </ul>	20		
<b>II. TECHNICAL APPROACH</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tasks and approach clearly described</li> <li>Legal defensibility and usefulness of proposed impact assessment and technical studies</li> <li>Focus on issues important to a Program EIR: significant impacts, growth-inducing and cumulative impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures</li> <li>Usefulness and adequacy of the Consultant’s proposed methodology to evaluate growth-inducing and cumulative impacts from each alternative</li> <li>Complete/thorough description of work plan</li> <li>Familiarity with regional and local issues</li> </ul>	25		
<b>III. PROJECT MANAGEMENT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable total number and distribution of hours</li> <li>Qualifications of key individuals including: impact assessment and CEQA expertise, management and interpersonal skills, and writing skills (clear and concise prose)</li> <li>Demonstrated knowledge of the challenges associated with environmental assessment at the programmatic level</li> <li>Time commitment of key individuals</li> <li>Capability to reallocate resources as needed to meet project schedule</li> </ul>	20		
<b>IV. COST</b> Expected benefit to cost: Practicality and applicability of the proposed overall PEIR methodology to the 2004 RTP (expected benefit) vs. total Consultant budget (cost)	15		
<b>V. REASONABLENESS OF SCHEDULE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total time allocated for each task is realistic</li> <li>Logical and realistic timing of each task</li> </ul>	15		
<b>VI. DBE PARTICIPATION</b>	5		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>		

Name of Evaluator (print): \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Attachment 4

**CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF ORAL PRESENTATION**  
**RFP No. 03-013**

Consultant Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Max. Possibl e Points	Points Earned	Comments
----------	--------------------------------	------------------	----------

<b>I. DEMONSTRATED UNDERSTANDING OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE 2004 RTP PEIR</b>	<b>15</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand the required alternatives evaluation, growth-inducing impacts evaluation, and cumulative impacts analysis</li> <li>Understand Regional Transportation Plans</li> </ul>			
<b>II. TECHNICAL APPROACH</b>	<b>30</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legal defensibility of proposed impact assessment and technical studies</li> <li>Focus on issues important to a Program EIR: significant impacts, growth-inducing and cumulative impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures</li> <li>Familiarity with regional and local issues</li> <li>Usefulness of proposed alternatives analysis</li> <li>Ability to evaluate growth patterns (and related environmental impacts) associated with alternative transportation plans</li> </ul>			
<b>III. PROJECT MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>20</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Qualifications of key individuals including: impact assessment and CEQA expertise, management and interpersonal skills, and writing skills (clear and concise prose)</li> <li>Time commitment of key individuals</li> <li>Demonstrated knowledge of the challenges associated with environmental assessment at the programmatic level</li> <li>Reasonable total number and distribution of hours</li> <li>Capability to reallocate resources as needed to meet project schedule</li> <li>Flexibility and ability to meet with SCAG staff</li> <li>History of legal defensibility of CEQA documents prepared by the Consultant</li> </ul>			
<b>IV. COST</b>	<b>15</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expected benefit to cost: Practicality and applicability of the proposed overall PEIR methodology to the 2004 RTP (expected benefit) vs. total Consultant budget (cost)</li> </ul>			
<b>V. REASONABLENESS OF SCHEDULE</b>	<b>15</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total time allocated for each task is realistic</li> <li>Logical and realistic timing of each task</li> </ul>			
<b>VI. DBE PARTICIPATION</b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>		

**Name of Evaluator (print):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature of Evaluator:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Agency:** \_\_\_\_\_

## CONTRACT BUDGET EXPLANATORY INFORMATION

### RFP No. 03-013

The sample line item budget on the following page reflects the most common format used to present budget or compensation information in contracts for planning services. Under this format, the consultant is compensated for its costs, plus given a fixed fee. All consultant (and subcontractor) costs must be allowable and consistent with Federal cost principles (see term VII, paragraph F of the MPO/Consultant Contract Boilerplate). Please be aware that the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost bid method, where the consultant's profit is a percentage of the reimbursed costs on a project, is not allowed under Federal rules.

In reviewing the sample line item budget, the following should be considered:

- Under direct labor, it is preferable to identify professional staff by both name and position. Such a format ties the level of effort to the staff actually responsible for the project.
- Direct labor and fringe benefits must be shown as separate dollar amounts.
- There are no provisions in the contract budget for contingency fees.
- The salary rate quoted should be the highest rate of compensation the staffer/position is expected to receive during the life of the contract. Expected merit or cost-of-living increases should be incorporated into the quoted rate.

**All consultants must prepare and submit a line item budget using the exact format shown on the following page, or may risk having their proposal disqualified.** Furthermore, for any proposal with a total contract value of \$250,000 or more, any subcontractor whose portion of the work is \$25,000 or more must also prepare and submit their own line item budget as part of the proposal.

# SAMPLE LINE ITEM BUDGET

Consultant: Planning Horizon Services  
1234 Front Street, Suite 100  
Main Street, CA 95814-2100

RFP No.: 03-013

Project: Guideway Network Study

## DIRECT LABOR

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Amount</u>
A. Adams, Project Manager	100	\$30.00/hr.	\$ 3,000
B. Brown, Project Leader	1,000	\$24.00/hr.	\$ 24,000
C. Charley, Project Technician	1,000	\$20.00/hr.	\$ 20,000
Clerical support (direct charges)	<u>250</u>	\$12.00/hr.	<u>\$ 3,000</u>
<b>SUBTOTAL – DIRECT LABOR</b>	<b>2,350</b>		<b>\$ 50,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Direct Labor rates must be traceable to current payroll records.

## OVERHEAD AND FRINGE BENEFITS<sup>2</sup>

Direct Labor Overhead (as determined from company records)	\$ 40,000
Fringe Benefits (as determined from company records)	<u>\$ 15,000</u>
<b>SUBTOTAL – OVERHEAD AND FRINGE BENEFITS</b>	<b>\$ 55,000</b>

<sup>2</sup> Many items that are normal business practice costs and tax deductible are not allowable under Federal and State contract rules (e.g., dues, advertising, contributions, bad debts, interest expense, meals, and entertainment). For a complete listing, see 48 CFR 18.36 and OMB-87.

**TOTAL DIRECT LABOR, OVERHEAD, AND FRINGE BENEFITS** **\$105,000**

FIXED FEE<sup>3</sup> (rate should be consistent with other billings for similar services) **\$ 10,500**

<sup>3</sup> Fixed Fee is calculated on Direct Labor, Overhead and Fringe Benefits only, not on Subcontractors/Subconsultants.

## SUBCONTRACTORS<sup>4</sup>

<u>Subcontractor</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Choo-Choo Engineers	1,000	\$30.00/hr.	\$ 30,000
Overhead and Fringe (50%)			<u>\$ 15,000</u>
Subtotal			\$ 45,000
Fixed Fee (10%)			<u>\$ 4,500</u>
Total Choo-Choo Engineers			\$ 49,500
W. Water, Environmental Consultant	<u>100</u>	\$36.00/hr.	<u>\$ 3,600</u>
<b>SUBTOTAL – SUBCONTRACTORS</b>	<b>1,100</b>		<b>\$ 53,100</b>

<sup>4</sup> All subcontractors whose portion of the total contract is valued at \$25,000 or more must break out their costs above in the same format as has been done for Choo-Choo Engineers.

## OTHER DIRECT COSTS (ODCs)<sup>5</sup>

Graphics development	\$ 2,500
Postage	\$ 100
Printing	\$ 1,000
Telephone (long distance)	\$ 200
Travel (local)	\$ 200
Parking	<u>\$ 75</u>
<b>SUBTOTAL – OTHER DIRECT COSTS</b>	<b>\$ 4,075</b>

<sup>5</sup> ODCs must be fully documented and included with invoices during the contract period of performance. If contract is subject to a pre-award audit, support for these ODCs will be reviewed similar to that done for Direct Labor, Overhead, and Fringe Benefits.

**TOTAL CONTRACT COST**<sup>6</sup> **\$172,675**

<sup>6</sup> Contracts less than \$250,000 MAY require a pre-award audit; those at \$250,000 or more WILL require a pre-award audit.

## **TITLE 49, CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS, PART 29 DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION CERTIFICATION**

**RFP No. 03-013**

All persons or firms, including subcontractors, must complete this certification and certify, under penalty of perjury, that, except as noted below, he/she or any person associated therewith in the capacity of owner, partner, director, officer, or manager:

is not currently under suspension, debarment, voluntary exclusion, or determination of ineligibility by any Federal agency;

has not been suspended debarred, voluntarily excluded or determined ineligible by any Federal agency within the past 3 years;

does not have a proposed debarment pending; and

has not been indicted, convicted, or had a civil judgment rendered against it by a court of competent jurisdiction in any matter involving fraud or official misconduct within the past 3 years.

If there are any exceptions to this certification, insert the exceptions in the following space.

Exceptions will not necessarily result in denial of award, but will be considered in determining bidder responsibility. For any exception noted above, indicate below to whom it applies, initiating agency, and dates of actions.

---

Name of Firm

---

Signature

---

Date

**SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM**

(revised February 2002)

**RFP No. 03-013****SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS**

All persons or firms seeking contracts valued at \$25,000 or more must complete and submit this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form to SCAG along with your contract proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subcontractors whose portion of the overall work is valued at \$25,000 or more. Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your contract proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, you will need to review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at [www.scag.ca.gov](http://www.scag.ca.gov). The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "Doing Business with SCAG," whereas the SCAG staff and Regional Council members lists can be found under "About SCAG."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to Justine Block, SCAG Deputy Legal Counsel.

**Name of Firm:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Name or Description:** \_\_\_\_\_

**RFP Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date Submitted:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Preparer's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION II: QUESTIONS**

- Does your firm have any existing relationships with employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council that could be construed as involving "conflicts of interests" (i.e., financial interests) within the meaning of the SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy, or which would give rise to a conflict if your firm becomes a recipient of a contract with SCAG?

\_\_\_\_\_ **YES**          \_\_\_\_\_ **NO**

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the relationship:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Relationship</b>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve months?

\_\_\_\_\_ **YES**                  \_\_\_\_\_ **NO**

If “yes,” please list name, position, and dates of service:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Dates of Service</b>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your contract proposal?

\_\_\_\_\_ **YES**                  \_\_\_\_\_ **NO**

If “yes,” please list name and the nature of the relationship:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Relationship</b>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. In the last twelve months, have you or any members of your firm been a business partner of, employed, or been about to employ an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council?

\_\_\_\_\_ **YES**                  \_\_\_\_\_ **NO**

If “yes,” please list name and the nature of the relationship:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Relationship</b>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, contributions (including political contributions) or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council?

\_\_\_\_\_ **YES**                  \_\_\_\_\_ **NO**

If “yes,” please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

**SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT**

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the selected firm.

Project Name or Description: \_\_\_\_\_

RFP Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**DECLARATION**

I, (printed full name) \_\_\_\_\_, (Social Security Number; optional) \_\_\_\_\_ hereby declare that I am the (position or title) \_\_\_\_\_ of (firm name) \_\_\_\_\_, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated \_\_\_\_\_ is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Person Certifying for Selected Firm

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**NOTICE**

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

